

Dear Senator Doyle, Representative Reed, and Members of the Committee on Energy and Technology,

My name is Robb Sauerhoff and I strongly support increasing access to electric vehicles, but as written, I cannot support H.B. 5510, An Act Concerning Electric, Zero Emission and Hydrogen Vehicles. The bill puts unnecessary barriers in place and by providing unclear and unnecessary definitions, duplicates and contradicts existing laws and regulations.

Motor vehicles are the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions and criteria air pollutants that adversely affect the health and well-being of Connecticut citizens. As their name implies, electric and zero emission vehicles emit no greenhouse gases. These vehicles, which require no gasoline and emit no tailpipe pollution, present a critical opportunity to slash dangerous pollution, reduce oil dependence, and forever change the impact of transportation on our health and planet.

Even factoring in emissions from the electricity generated to power today's EVs, these cars are cleaner than conventional vehicles, about 25 to 80 percent lower in emissions, depending on location. As we switch to cleaner sources of energy, emissions from electric vehicle charging drop even further.

Increased adoption of electric vehicles, including models that are affordably priced for many, provides a tremendous opportunity for Connecticut residents. EVs, like the more than 20 models now on the market of both all-electric and plug-in hybrid cars, are:

- 1) Good for consumers, the local economy, and energy independence;
- 2) Crucial for slashing carbon emissions;
- 3) A key part of a modernized electric grid; and
- 4) Fun to drive - and I can say that with plenty of experience driving EV rental cars on business trips.

By removing some of the existing barriers to owning zero emission and electric vehicles, we can enable more Connecticut residents to drive emission free, but instead of removing barriers, this bill puts more barriers in place. If passed as written, section nine of the bill would charge owners of EV charging stations \$50 a year, discouraging their installation. To get more electric vehicles on the road, charging needs to be more convenient. Connecticut needs EV charging stations as common of a sight as gas stations. Section nine needs to be deleted.

Other sections of the bill should be cut too, including sections 7, 10, and 11. The language in these sections is overly confusing or duplicates or conflicts with other laws or regulations.

To decrease dangerous climate pollution, electric and zero emission vehicles need to be the easy and convenient transportation choice, it's the only way we'll take gas guzzlers and their dirty pollution off our roads. If amended, H.B. 5510, An Act Concerning Electric, Zero Emission and Hydrogen Vehicles, has the ability to do just that -- to drive away Connecticut's climate pollution -- but until then I cannot support this bill.

Thank you,

Robb Sauerhoff
Bridgeport, CT

Ciao!
Robb
robbs@optonline.net

"we are all together one"